arXiv:1304.6059v2 [math.KT] 29 Apr 2013

Non-commutative localizations of additive categories and weight structures; applications to birational motives

Mikhail V. Bondarko, Vladimir A. Sosnilo *

April 30, 2013

Abstract

In this paper we demonstrate that 'non-commutative localizations' of arbitrary additive categories (generalizing those defined by Cohn for rings) are closely (and naturally) related with weight structures. Localizing an arbitrary triangulated $\underline{C}$ by a set S of morphisms in the heart of a weight structure w for it one obtains a triangulated category endowed with a weight structure w'. The heart of w' is a certain idempotent completion of the non-commutative localization $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ of $\underline{Hw}$ by S. $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is the natural categorical version of Cohn's localizations of rings i.e. the functor $\underline{Hw} \to \underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is universal among all the additive functors that make the elements of S invertible. In particular, taking $\underline{C} = K^b(A)$ for an additive A we obtain a very efficient tool for computing $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$; using it, we generalize the calculations of Gerasimov and Malcolmson. We also prove that $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ coincides with the 'abstract' localization $A[S^{-1}]$ (as constructed by Gabriel and Zisman) if S contains all A-identities and is closed with respect to direct sums.

We apply our results to certain categories of birational motives $DM^o_{gm}(U)$ (generalizing those defined by Kahn and Sujatha). When U is the spectrum of a perfect field, the weight structure obtained is compatible with the Chow and Gersten weight structures defined by the first author in previous papers. For a general U the result is completely new. It enables us to calculate the Grothendieck group of $DM^o_{gm}(U)$.

---

*The work is supported by RFBR (grants no. 11-01-00588 and 12-01-33057) and by the Saint-Petersburg State University research grant no. 6.38.75.2011.

Contents

1 Weakly negative classes in triangulated categories and localizations 6
1.1 Weakly negative classes of objects and Verdier localizations . . 7
1.2 On the universal additive functor inverting a set of morphisms 10

2 On 'additive localizations': our computations and their comparison with existing results and methods 12
2.1 Certain computations in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ 12
2.2 The comparison of our results with the theory of Cohn's localizations 18

3 On weight structures in localizations 19
3.1 A reminder on weight structures 19
3.2 The relation of weight structures with 'additive localizations' . 22
3.3 The relation with adjacent t-structures 25

4 On birational motives and weights for them 29
4.1 The definition of birational motives 29
4.2 A weight structure for $DM^o_{gm}(U)$ 30

Introduction

For an additive category A and some $S \subset \mathrm{Mor}(A)$ it is natural to ask the following questions:

(i) does there exist an initial object in the category of those additive functors from A to (an additive) A' such that all elements of S become invertible in A?

(ii) how can one describe the target $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ of this functor?

(iii) is $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ isomorphic to the 'abstract' (i.e. Gabriel-Zisman) localization of A by S?

In the case when A is the category of finitely generated free modules over a (associative unitial) ring R the answer to questions (i) and (ii) is given by the theory of non-commutative localizations of rings introduced in [Coh85] (see §2.2 and §3.3 below for more references). In the current paper we extend the corresponding results to a (somewhat) more general setting of an arbitrary additive A. We also recall that the answer to (iii) is positive if S contains all A-identities and is closed under direct sums.

We give a comprehensive description of $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$. Our main 'computational' tool is the consideration of $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ as the corresponding full subcategory of the Verdier localization of $K^b(A)$ by S. This setting is closely related with weight structures (as was shown in several previous papers of the first author, those are important cousins of t-structures). We prove that a weight structure w necessarily induces a weight structure for $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ if $\underline{D}$ is generated by objects of 'length 1' i.e. if we invert a set S of $\underline{Hw}$-morphisms (in contrast to the situation with t-structures, w does not have to induce a weight structure on $\underline{D}$; we will say more on this matter at the end of this Introduction). The heart of this weight structure is the Karoubization of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. So, one can describe $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ using any triangulated $\underline{C}$ whose heart is an idempotent completion of A. We also prove (in the case of a compactly generated $\underline{\mathcal{D}} \subset \underline{C}$, $\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ is weakly generated by $\{\mathrm{Cone}(S)\}$) that $\underline{C}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ possesses a t-structure *adjacent* to $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}}$ and calculate its heart.

We apply our results to certain triangulated categories of (geometric) birational motives. Those are obtained from (a version of) effective geometric Voevodsky's motives (over a scheme U) by inverting birational equivalences (and by Karoubization). So, there exists a weight structure w_{bir} on the category $DM^o_{gm}(U)$ obtained. $\underline{Hw}_{bir}$ is given by retracts of motives of (smooth) U-schemes; our results allow calculating morphism groups for the heart. The existence of w_{bir} previously was only known for U being (the spectrum of) a perfect field; even in this case we obtain a new 'elementary' proof of this fact. As shown in previous papers, the existence of a weight structure yields functorial weight filtrations and weight spectral sequences for any cohomology theory that factorizes through birational motives, and a conservative exact weight complex functor whose target is $K^b(\underline{Hw}_{bir})$. We also calculate the Grothendieck group of $DM^o_{gm}(U)$.

Now we list the contents of the paper in more detail.

We start §1 with certain calculations in a triangulated category $\underline{C}$ that contains a *weakly negative* class of objects B. We prove that any object in the triangulated subcategory $\underline{D}$ of $\underline{C}$ generated by B is a cone of a morphism of 'more simple objects' (i.e. that it has a *weak weight decomposition*). It follows that a presentation of a morphism in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ as a 'roof' can be 'simplified' under certain conditions. This technical result yields: for an additive A, $S \subset \mathrm{Mor}\,A$, $B = \{\mathrm{Cone}(S)\}$, the functor that sends A to the subcategory $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ of $K^b(A)/\underline{D}$ whose objects are those of A, is universal among additive functors that convert all elements of S into isomorphisms. We also recall that $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ coincides with the 'abstract' localization of A by S (as constructed by Gabriel and Zisman) if S contains all identities and is closed under direct sums.

In §2 we 'compute' the category $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ very explicitly. In particular, we prove that in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ any morphism can be presented as $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$ where $i, g \in \mathrm{Mor}(A)$, s is invertible in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (see Proposition 2.1.2).

Other significant computations of this section are Propositions 2.1.4 and (especially) 2.1.7. We also compare our results with (some of) the results of the theory of non-commutative localizations of rings.

In §3 we recall some basics on weight structures. For a $\underline{D}$ generated by cones of a set S of $\underline{Hw}$-morphisms (where w is a weight structure for $\underline{C}$) we prove the existence of a weight structure on $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ such that the localization functor is exact. The heart of this weight structure is the Karoubization of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ (it is completely determined by $\underline{Hw}$ and S in the 'bounded' case). For certain 'big' (and compactly generated) $\underline{\mathfrak{D}} \subset \underline{C}$ and $\underline{Hw}$ 'weakly generated' by an additive A we prove: $\underline{C}/\underline{\mathfrak{D}}$ possesses a t-structure *adjacent* to $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{\mathfrak{D}}}$ whose heart is the category of additive functors from $A[S^{-1}]^{op}$ to Ab. This is a certain generalization of (some of) the 'triangulated results' of [Dwy06] and [NeR04].

In §4 we introduce certain categories of birational motives (via the method of [KaS02]). It is easily seen that the results of the previous sections can be applied to them. So, we discuss their 'weights' and calculate K_0 for these categories.

Now, for the convenience of readers already acquainted with weight structures (in particular with [Bon10a]) we describe the relation of our current results with those of (§8.1 of) ibid; we also recall the behaviour of t-structures in localizations. Several properties of weight structures are quite similar to those of t-structures; in particular, it was proved in loc. cit.: if a weight structure w for $\underline{C}$ restricts to a weight structure for $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$, then it also yields a weight structure for $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ (i.e. the localization functor $p : \underline{C} \to \underline{C}/\underline{D}$ is weight-exact). Note here: the 'most simple' way to construct a $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$ such that w restricts to it is to 'generate' it by an additive subcategory of $\underline{Hw}$ (one actually obtains all possible $\underline{D}$ this way if w is bounded). Now, for the setting of t-structures we certainly have: if the localization functor p is t-exact, then $t_{\underline{C}}$ restricts to a t-structure for $\underline{D}$. Indeed, since t-decompositions are canonical, we obtain: both components of the $t_{\underline{C}}$-decomposition of an object killed by p also belong to the kernel of p. Now, a crucial distinction of weight decompositions (see (4) below) from t-ones is that they are not canonical; so this argument cannot be carried over to weight structures. Moreover, if $\underline{D}$ is generated by cones of any (!) set of $\underline{Hw}$-morphisms then W yields a weight structure for $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$, though w usually does not restrict to a weight structure for $\underline{D}$ (since there are 'not enough' objects in $\underline{C}_{w=0} \cap \underline{D}$, we only have 'weak weight decompositions' inside $\underline{D}$; cf. Remark 1.1.4(1) below)! A certain 'explanation' of this distinction between weight and t-structures is given by the notion of adjacent structures; see §3.3 for more detail.

The first author is deeply grateful to prof. L. Barbieri-Viale, the Landau Network-Centro Volta, and the Cariplo Foundation for the wonderful work-

ing conditions during his staying in the Milano University where he started writing this paper. Both authors are very grateful to prof. D.-C. Cisinski, prof. A.I. Generalov, prof. B. Kahn, prof. A. Neeman, and prof. L.E. Positselski for their interesting comments.

Notation and conventions. For a category C, $X, Y \in \operatorname{Obj} C$, we denote by $C(X, Y)$ the set of C-morphisms from X into Y. We denote by $\operatorname{Mor}(C)$ the class of all morphisms of C; $\operatorname{Isom}(C) \subset \operatorname{Mor}(C)$ is the subclass of all isomorphisms; $\operatorname{id}(\operatorname{Obj} C) \subset \operatorname{Isom}(C)$ is the subclass of identity morphisms (of all objects of C).

For categories C', C we write $C' \subset C$ if C' is a full subcategory of C.

For a category C, $X, Y \in \operatorname{Obj} C$, we say that X is a *retract* of Y (and Y is coretract of X) if id_X can be factorized as $X \xrightarrow{i} Y \xrightarrow{p} X$ (if C is triangulated or abelian, then X is a retract of Y whenever X is its direct summand). We will call p a retraction; i will be called a coretraction.

For an $H \subset C$ the subcategory H is called *Karoubi-closed* in C if it contains all retracts of its objects in C. For a general H the full subcategory $\operatorname{Kar}_C(H)$ of C whose objects are all retracts of objects of H (in C) will be called the *Karoubi-closure* of H in C.

The Karoubization $\operatorname{Kar}(A)$ (no lower index) of an additive A is the category of 'formal images' of idempotents in A (so A is embedded into an idempotent complete category that contains its *small envelope* defined in Definition 3.1.1(VIII) below; it is triangulated if A is). We will say that A is Karoubian if $A \cong \operatorname{Kar}(A)$ i.e. if any idempotent morphism yields a direct sum decomposition in A.

$\underline{C}$ below will always denote some triangulated category; usually it will be endowed with a weight structure w.

$D \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ will be called *extension-closed* if it contains 0 and for any distinguished triangle $X \to Y \to Z$ in $\underline{C}$ we have: $X, Z \in D \implies Y \in D$. We will call the smallest extension-closed subclass of objects of $\underline{C}$ that contains a given class $B \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ the *extension-closure* of B.

For a $D \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ we will denote by $\langle D \rangle$ the smallest full Karoubi-closed triangulated subcategory of $\underline{C}$ containing D, whereas the smallest full strict triangulated subcategory $\underline{D}$ of $\underline{C}$ containing D will be called the triangulated subcategory generated by D (i.e. $\langle D \rangle$ is the Karoubization of $\underline{D}$ in $\underline{C}$).

For $X, Y \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ we will write $X \perp Y$ if $\underline{C}(X, Y) = \{0\}$. For $D, E \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ we will write $D \perp E$ if $X \perp Y$ for all $X \in D$, $Y \in E$. For $D \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ we will denote by $D^{\perp}$ the class

$$\{Y \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C} : \ X \perp Y \ \forall X \in D\}.$$

Dually, ${}^{\perp}D$ is the class $\{Y \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C} : \ Y \perp X \ \forall X \in D\}$.

For an additive category A we will denote by $K^b(A) \subset K(A)$ the category of (bounded) cohomological complexes over A. For $i \leq j \in \mathbb{Z}$ we will denote by $K^b(A)^{\geq i}$ (resp. $K^b(A)^{\leq i}$) the class of those (bounded) complexes that are isomorphic (i.e. homotopy equivalent) to complexes that have non-zero terms only in degrees $\geq i$ (resp. $\leq i$); $K^b(A)^{[i,j]}$ is the class of complexes isomorphic to those that have non-zero terms only in degrees from i to j. We will also use a similar notation for the whole $K(A)$. In our arguments below we usually can (and will) assume that the corresponding complexes are concentrated in degrees $\geq i$ (resp. $\leq i$, resp. in degrees between i and j) themselves. When we will say that an arrow (or a sequence of arrows) in A yields an object of $K^b(A)$ we will mean by default that the last object of this sequence is in degree 0; yet note that we will ignore this convention when the terms of a complex are indexed by numbers (in $T^0 \to T^1$ the term T^1 is in degree 1). We will always extend a 'finite' A-complex by 0's to $\pm\infty$ (in order to obtain an object of $K^b(A)$). For a single morphism $f \in A(C^{-1}, C^0)$ we will also call the complex $C^{-1} \xrightarrow{f} C^0$ the cone of f. We will use a similar convention for triangulated categories (i.e. for any $f \in \underline{C}(X, Y)$ we have a distinguished triangle $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \to \operatorname{Cone}(f) \to X[1]$.

1 Weakly negative classes in triangulated categories and localizations

First we recall certain basic facts on localizations of categories. Everywhere in the paper except §3.3 we will only consider essentially small categories (in order to avoid set-theoretic difficulties).

By Lemma I1.2 of [GaC67], for any category C and any set $S \subset \operatorname{Mor} C$ there exists an initial object in the category of those functors from C that converts all elements of S into invertible morphisms. We will denote the target of this functor by $C[S^{-1}]$ and call it the 'abstract' or the 'Gabriel-Zisman' localization of C by S. We have $\operatorname{Obj} C[S^{-1}] = \operatorname{Obj} C$; any morphism in $C[S^{-1}]$ can factorized into the composition of a chain of morphisms each of those either comes from C or is inverse to some element of S (in $C[S^{-1}]$). It follows: any morphism in $C[S^{-1}]$ can be presented as the composition $f_1 s_1^{-1} f_2 s_2^{-1} \dots f_n s_n^{-1}$ (a *zig-zag*) for some $n \geq 0$, $f_i \in \operatorname{Mor} C$, $s_i \in S$. We will call a single composition $f_i s_i^{-1}$ of this sort a *roof*.

A caution: in Remark 1.2.1 below we will introduce an additive version of this definition (cf. also Theorem 1.2.2) for an additive A; a priori we only have a comparison functor $Q : A[S^{-1}] \to A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ that does not have to be an isomorphism (though it 'usually' is; see Corollary 1.2.3). Note still that we have $\operatorname{Obj} A[S^{-1}]_{add} = \operatorname{Obj} A[S^{-1}] = \operatorname{Obj} A$.

By a localization of $\underline{C}$ by a triangulated subcategory $\underline{D}$ we will mean the Verdier localization of $\underline{C}$ by the Karoubi-closure $\underline{D}'$ of $\underline{D}$ in $\underline{C}$. We recall (see §2.1 of [Nee01]) that this is the localization of $\underline{C}$ by those morphisms whose cones belong to $\operatorname{Obj} \underline{D}'$. Note that this is also a triangulated category; any morphism in it can be presented as a single 'roof' fs^{-1}.

1.1 Weakly negative classes of objects and Verdier localizations

Definition 1.1.1. 1. We will say that $D \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ is *weakly negative* if $\{0\} \in D$ and $D \perp (\cup_{i>1} D[i])$.

2. For any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a weakly negative D we will denote by $D_{[i,j]}$ the extension-closure of $\cup_{i \le l \le j} D[j]$ if $j \ge i$, and set $D_{[i,j]} = \{0\}$ if $j < i$. We denote $\cup_{i \le j} D_{[i,j]}$ by $D_{\le j}$; $D_{\ge i} = \cup_{j \ge i} D_{[i,j]}$.

Remark 1.1.2. 1. The weak negativity condition is a weakening of the negativity that is fulfilled for the hearts of weight structures; see Remark 3.1.2 below. Respectively, $D_{[i,j]}$ corresponds to $\underline{C}_{[i,j]}$ for $\underline{C}$ endowed with a weight structure (see Definition 3.1.1(IV)).

2. Certainly, the triangulated category generated by D equals the union of $D_{[-N,N]}$ for all $N > 0$.

3. Our basic example of a weakly negative class is $D \subset K^b(A)^{[-1,0]}$; its generalization is $D \subset \underline{C}_{[0,1]}$ for $\underline{C}$ endowed with a weight structure w. For both of these examples our Proposition 1.1.3(2–4) has consequences that are (more or less) easy to formulate.

Now we prove a technical statement that is crucial for this paper.

Proposition 1.1.3. *Let $\underline{C}$ be a triangulated category, $B \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ is a weakly negative set. Denote by $\underline{D}(\subset \langle B \rangle \subset \underline{C})$ the triangulated subcategory of $\underline{C}$ generated by B. Then the following statements are valid.*

1. For any $m \le 0, n > 0$, $M \in B_{[m,n]}$, there exists a distinguished triangle

$$X \to M \to Y \xrightarrow{f} X[1] \tag{1}$$

for some $X \in B_{[m,0]}$, $Y \in B_{[1,n]}$ (it may be called a weak weight decomposition of M; cf. (4) below).

2. For an $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $X \in {}^{\perp}B_{\ge 1}$, $Y \in B^{\perp}_{\le n-2}$. Then any $e \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}(X,Y)$ can be presented as hq^{-1} for some $Z \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$, $h \in \underline{C}(Z,Y)$, $q \in \underline{C}(Z,X)$, $\operatorname{Cone}(q) \in B_{[n,0]}$.

3. For n, X, Y, Z, e, h, q as above we have: $e = 0$ whenever h can be factorized in $\underline{C}$ through an element of $B_{[n-1,0]}$.

4. Let $X \in {}^{\perp}B_{\geq 1}$, $Y \in B_{\leq -1}^{\perp}$*. Then* $\underline{C}(X,Y)$ *surjects onto* $\underline{C}/\underline{D}(X,Y)$*.*

Proof. 1. Essentially, here we can apply Proposition 3.5.3(8) of [Bon10c] (we set $F = 0$ in that statement). Note that the formulation of loc. cit. yields only that we can choose X, Y belonging to the Karoubizations of $B_{[m,0]}$ and $B_{[1,n]}$ in $\underline{C}$, respectively. Yet the arguments used in the proof of the fact do actually yield the statement desired.

Alternatively, one can deduce the statement in question from the results of Appendix B of [Pos11].

2. We recall that (by the theory of Verdier localization) e can be presented as $h_1 q_1^{-1}$ for some $q_1 : Z_1 \to X$ such that $T_1 = \operatorname{Cone}(q_1[-1]) \in \operatorname{Obj}\langle B\rangle$. Now, T_1 is a retract of some $T_2 \in \operatorname{Obj}\underline{D}$; so $T_2 \cong T_1 \bigoplus T'$ for some $T' \in \operatorname{Obj}\langle B\rangle$. Hence e can also be presented as $h_2 q_2^{-1}$ for $Z_2 = Z_1 \bigoplus T'$, $h_2 = h_1 \bigoplus 0_{T',Y}$, $q_2 = q_1 \bigoplus 0_{T',X}$; note that $\operatorname{Cone}(q_2) \cong T_2[1]$.

Applying assertion 1 of our proposition to $T_2[1]$ we obtain: for some large enough N there exists a distinguished triangle $T_3 \to T_2 \to V \to T_3[1]$ such that $T_3 \in B_{[-N-1,-1]}$, $V \in B_{[0,N-1]}$.

Since $X \perp V[1]$, we can factorize the morphism c in the distinguished triangle $T_2 \to Z_2 \xrightarrow{q_2} X \xrightarrow{c} T_2[1]$ through $T_3[1]$. Hence there exist $Z_3 \in \operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$ and a morphism $d : Z_3 \to Z_2$ with $\operatorname{Cone}(d) \cong V \in \operatorname{Obj}\underline{D}$. We set $q_3 = s_2 \circ d$; by the octahedral axiom we can choose d so that $\operatorname{Cone}(s_3) \cong T_3[1]$. Besides, for $h_3 = d \circ h$ we have: $h_2 q_2^{-1} = h_3 q_3^{-1}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$.

Next, applying assertion 1 of our proposition to $T_3[2-n]$ we obtain: there exists a distinguished triangle $U \to T_3 \to T \to U[1]$ such that $U \in B_{[-N-1,n-2]}$, $T \in B_{[n-1,-1]}$. Hence the octahedral axiom yields: there exist a $Z \in \operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$, an $m \in \underline{C}(Z_3, Z)$ such that $\operatorname{Cone}(m) = U[1] \in \operatorname{Obj}\underline{D}$, and a morphism $q \in \underline{C}(Z, X)$ with $\operatorname{Cone}(q) \cong T[1]$. Now, since $U \perp Y$, h_3 can be factorized as $h \circ m$ for some $h \in \underline{C}(Z, Y)$. Thus $h_3 q_3^{-1} = hq^{-1}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$, and we obtain the result.

3. Certainly, $e = 0$ whenever $h = 0$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. Besides, since any $T \in B_{n,0}$ becomes 0 in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$, any morphism that factorizes through T vanishes in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. It remains to prove the converse implication. We note: $Z \in {}^{\perp}B_{\geq 1}$, since for any $b \in B$, $i \geq 1$, we have a long exact sequence $\dots \to \underline{C}(X, b[i]) \to \underline{C}(Z, b[i]) \to \underline{C}(\operatorname{Cone}(s[-1]), b[i]) \to \dots$; it remains to apply the weak negativity of B.

Next, a well-known (and easily proven) property of Verdier localizations yields: h vanishes in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ whenever it factorizes through an object of $\langle B\rangle$. Then it certainly also factorizes through some $T_1 \in B_{[-N,N]}$ for a large enough N.

Next we use certain arguments that (also) are quite similar to the proof of the previous assertion.

Applying assertion 1 of our proposition to T_1 we obtain: there exists a distinguished triangle $T_2 \to T_1 \to U \to T_2[1]$ such that $T_2 \in B_{[-N,0]}$, $U \in B_{[1,N]}$. Since $Z \perp U$, we can factorize h into the composition $Z \to T_2 \xrightarrow{h'} Y$.

Now we apply assertion 1 to $T_2[2-n]$. We obtain a distinguished triangle $V \to T_2 \to T \to V[1]$ for some $T \in B_{[n-1,0]}$, $V \in B_{\le n-2}$. Since $V \perp Y$, we can factorize h' through T; hence the same is true for h.

4. It suffices to note: by assertion 2 (applied in the case $n = 1$) any $e \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}(X,Y)$ can be presented as hq^{-1} where the cone of q is zero i.e. it is a $\underline{C}$-isomorphism.

□

We will use this proposition several times below. Yet before that we would like to make some extra 'computational' remarks (they may be skipped on first reading).

Remark 1.1.4. 1. Let w be a weight structure for a triangulated $\underline{C}$; see Definition 3.1.1 below. Then any $B \in \underline{C}_{[0,1]}$ is easily seen to be weakly negative; the conditions of Proposition 1.1.3(2,3) are fulfilled for any $X \in \underline{C}_{w \le 0}$, $Y \in \underline{C}_{w \ge n}$.

Besides, in this case we have $B_{[m,n]} \subset \underline{C}_{[m,n+1]}$ for any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, for the weak weight decomposition (1) we have $X \in \underline{C}_{[m,1]}$, $Y \in \underline{C}_{[0,n]}$, whereas for the 'usual' weight decomposition (see (4)) we would certainly have $X \in \underline{C}_{m,0}$.

2. Certainly, for any arbitrary $B \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ (that is not necessarily weakly negative) and the corresponding $\underline{D}$ we have: if $X \perp \cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} B[i]$ then $\underline{C}(X,Y) \cong \underline{C}/\underline{D}(X,Y)$ for any $Y \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C} = \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}/\underline{D}$.

Now, assume that for some additive $A \subset \underline{C}$ and $S \subset \operatorname{Mor}(A)$ we have: the objects of B are cones of elements of S. Then one can apply the previous statement whenever for any $s \in S$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have: $\underline{C}(X,-)(s[i])$ is a bijection. In the case when $\underline{C} = K(A)$ it certainly suffices to consider $i = 0$ here.

Now, let $X \in \operatorname{Obj} A$; assume that S contains $\operatorname{id}(\operatorname{Obj} A)$ and is closed with respect to compositions. Consider the category S_X whose objects are $\cup_{Z \in \operatorname{Obj} A} \{t_Z \in A(Z,X) : t_Z \in S\}$; the morphisms are elements of S that are compatible with the corresponding t_Z's. This category is not filtering in general, though it is in some interesting cases. Yet in any case for any $Y \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ one can consider $\varinjlim_{t_Z \in S_X} \underline{C}(Z,Y)$; though this is not a group, it still contains zero. For any distinguished triangle $Y \to V \xrightarrow{f} W \to Y[1]$ one can easily verify: $\varinjlim_{t_Z \in S_X} \underline{C}(Z, f[i])$ is bijective for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ whenever $\varinjlim_{t_Z \in S_X} \underline{C}(Z, Y[i]) = \{0\}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Now, if $\varinjlim_{t_Z \in S_X} \underline{C}(Z, s[i])$ is bijective for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $s \in S$, then we obtain for any $Y \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ a natural bijection $\varinjlim_{t_Z \in S_X} \underline{C}(Z,Y) \to \underline{C}/\underline{D}(Z,Y)$. In the case $\underline{C} = K(A)$ (and $i = 0$) we easily obtain that the latter statement is fulfilled if (A, S) satisfy the right Ore conditions (that are dual to the conditions in §I2.2 of [GaC67]). For a general $\underline{C}$ one may speak about certain 'generalized Ore conditions'.

3. One can also dualize the previous remark in the obvious way (in particular, one should consider the left Ore conditions).

4. It is easily seen that Proposition 1.1.3 cannot be applied to the situation when B is an arbitrary subset of $\underline{C}_{[0,2]}$ (or to $B \subset K^b(A)^{[-2,0]}$; cf. Remark 1.2.1 below). Indeed, for an abelian $\underline{A}$, $\underline{C} = K^b(\underline{A})$, B being the class of complexes coming from all short exact sequences in $\underline{A}$, we have $\underline{C}/\underline{D} = D^b(\underline{A})$, whereas $D^b(\underline{A})(M, N[r]) = \operatorname{Ext}^r_{\underline{A}}(M, N)$ for any $M, N \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{A}$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$; hence this group can be non-zero for any $r > 0$ (for general $\underline{A}, M, N$).

One can also obtain an example of this sort using (effective) Voevodsky's motives (the corresponding calculations are easy in the well understood case when the base is the spectrum of a perfect field); cf. §4.1 below.

1.2 On the universal additive functor inverting a set of morphisms

Now we fix certain notation.

Remark 1.2.1. 1. Till the end of §2.1 we will use the following notation: A is an additive category, $\underline{C} = K^b(A)$, S is a set of morphisms in A, $B \subset K^{[-1,0]}$ is the set of cones of elements of S, $D = B_{[0,0]}$ (in the notation of Proposition 1.1.3) is the extension-closure of B, $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$ is the triangulated category generated by B.

2. We denote by u the functor that sends A to the full subcategory of $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ whose objects are those of A. Note that u is an additive functor. Throughout this paper we will denote the target of u by $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$; we will justify this notation below.

Now we apply Proposition 1.1.3 to $\underline{C}$. A more general setting will be considered in §3 below.

Theorem 1.2.2. *1. For $X, Y \in \operatorname{Obj} A \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ any morphism $e \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}(X, Y)$ can be presented as hq^{-1} for some $Z \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$, $h \in \underline{C}(Z, Y)$, such that $q \in \underline{C}(Z, X)$, $\operatorname{Cone}(q) \in D$.*

$e = 0$ whenever h can be factorized through some T such that there exists a distinguished triangle $C_{-1} \to T \to C_0$ with $C_i \in D[i]$ (for $i = -1, 0$).

2. More generally, for $X \in K^b(A)^{\geq 0}$, $Y \in K^b(A)^{\leq -n}$ we have: any $e \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}(X, Y)$ can be presented as hq^{-1} for some $Z \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$, $h \in \underline{C}(Z, Y)$ such that $q \in \underline{C}(Z, X)$, $\operatorname{Cone}(q) \in B_{[n,0]}$ (in the notation of Proposition 1.1.3).

3. The functor $u : A \to A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ *(see the Remark above) is characterized by the following universal property: an additive functor* $F : A \to A'$ *uniquely factorizes through* u *whenever* F *converts all elements of* S *into isomorphisms.*

Proof. 1-2. It suffices to note that we can apply Proposition 1.1.3 to this setting; note that B is obviously weakly negative.

3. Certainly, u makes all elements of S invertible (since they become isomorphisms in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$). Conversely, assume that an additive F maps all elements of S into isomorphisms. We consider the exact functor $K^b(F) : \underline{C} \to K^b(A')$. In order to verify that F factorizes through u it suffices to check that $K^b(F)$ factorizes through the localization functor $\underline{C} \to \underline{C}/\underline{D}$. By the universal property of (Gabriel-Zisman) localizations to this end for any distinguished triangle $X \to Y \xrightarrow{f} Z \to X[1]$, $X \in \operatorname{Obj}\langle B\rangle$, we should prove that $K^b(F)(f)$ is an isomorphism. Since $K^b(F)$ is exact, to this end it suffices to verify that $G(X) = 0$ for such an X. Since $K^b(F)$ is additive, we only have to check that it kills all objects of $\underline{D}$. Applying the exactness of $K^b(F)$ again, we reduce this to the fact that $K^b(F)$ kills B.

In order to finish the proof, we should verify that $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ coincides with its smallest (in the sense of inclusions of morphisms sets) additive subcategory A_0 such that $\operatorname{Mor}(A_0)$ contains $u(\operatorname{Mor}(A))$ and also the inverses to all elements of S (note that $\operatorname{Obj} A = \operatorname{Obj} A_0 = \operatorname{Obj} A[S^{-1}]_{add}$). The latter fact is immediate from Remark 2.1.3(2) below (its proof relies on assertion 1 of this theorem, but does not use assertion 3).

□

Now we recall that $A[S^{-1}]$ is 'usually' additive; hence it is isomorphic to $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$.

Corollary 1.2.3. *Assume that* S *contains* $\operatorname{id}(\operatorname{Obj} A)$ *and is closed with respect to the direct sum operation. Then the natural functor* $Q : A[S^{-1}] \to A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ *is an isomorphism of categories.*

Proof. Theorem 1.2.2 yields: it suffices to verify whether $A[S^{-1}]$ has a natural structure of an additive category that is compatible with the one of A. This was done in §A3 of [KaS09] (see also [Cis10]). □

Remark 1.2.4. 1. For an arbitrary $S \subset \operatorname{Mor} A$ denote by $\mathcal{S}$ the closure of $S \cup \operatorname{id}(\operatorname{Obj} A)$ in $\operatorname{Mor}(A)$ with respect to the direct sum operation. Certainly, in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ all the elements of $\mathcal{S}$ become invertible. Hence we obtain: $A[S^{-1}]_{add} \cong A[\mathcal{S}^{-1}]_{add} \cong A[\mathcal{S}^{-1}]$.

2. It seems that the additivity of $A[S^{-1}]$ (for S as in Corollary 1.2.3) is well-known to experts in the field; yet 'classical' literature does not treat

the additive structure of $A[S^{-1}]$ unless S satisfies (either right of left) Ore condition.

3. Corollary 1.2.3 can also be deduced from Theorem 1.2.2(3) via a 'very explicit' method. To this end one should verify that any morphism in $A[S^{-1}]$ can be presented as in Proposition 2.1.2 below; then one should check that two morphisms presented in this form are equal in $A[S^{-1}]$ if they become equal in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (cf. Proposition 2.1.7(III2)).

2 On 'additive localizations': our computations and their comparison with existing results and methods

In this section we 'calculate' the category $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ 'explicitly'. This allows us to finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.2(3) (so our calculations do not use this assertion; yet we will apply part 1 of the Theorem several times). We also describe the relation of our results with the theory of non-commutative localizations of rings.

2.1 Certain computations in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$

We would like to give a certain description in terms of A of $\underline{C}/\underline{D}(a,b)$ for $a,b \in \operatorname{Obj} A = \operatorname{Obj} A[S^{-1}]_{add} \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}/\underline{D}$. Since any morphism between a and b can presented as a roof $h\circ q^{-1}$ (for $\operatorname{Cone}(q) \in D$, see Theorem 1.2.2(1)), we start with describing compositions and sums of roofs of this sort.

Lemma 2.1.1. *Let $F = f \circ s^{-1}$, $G = g \circ t^{-1}$, where $s : L \to a, t : T \to b, f : L \to b, g : T \to c$ are morphisms in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$, $a, b, c \in \operatorname{Obj} A$, the cones of the first two belong to D, and $L, T \in \underline{C}^{[0,1]}$. Denote by LT the complex $LT^0 = L^0 \oplus T^0$, $LT^1 = L^1 \oplus T^1 \oplus b$ and $d^0 = \begin{pmatrix} -d_L^0 & 0 \\ 0 & -d_T^0 \\ f^0 & t^0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then there are $q \in \underline{C}(LT, a)$, $q^0 = \begin{pmatrix} s^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $h \in \underline{C}(LT, c)$, $h^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g^0 \end{pmatrix}$, such that the composition $G \circ F$ equals $h \circ q^{-1}$ (in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$).*

Proof. LT is the cone of the composition $L \to b \to \operatorname{Cone}(t)$ shifted by $[-1]$. So, there exist a $q \in \underline{C}(LT, L)$ ($q'^0 = \begin{pmatrix} id_{L^0} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $q'^1 = \begin{pmatrix} id_{L^1} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$) whose cone belongs to D (hence q becomes invertible in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$), and an $h \in \underline{C}(LT, T)$ ($h'^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & id_{T^0} \end{pmatrix}$, $h'^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & id_{T^1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$) such that $f \circ q' = t \circ h'$. So, we obtain $G \circ F = g \circ t^{-1} \circ f \circ s^{-1} = (g \circ h') \circ (s \circ q')^{-1} = h \circ q^{-1}$. Thus $h^0 = g^0 \circ h'^0 = g^0 \circ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & id_{T^0} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g^0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $q^0 = s^0 \circ q'^0 = s^0 \circ \begin{pmatrix} id_{L^0} & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} s^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. ☐

Now we are able to describe morphisms in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ as certain 'short zig-zags'.

Proposition 2.1.2. *Let* $a, b \in \operatorname{Obj} A$. *Then any* $f \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}(a, b)$ *can be presented as the composition* $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, *where* $i : a \to a \oplus t$ *is the canonical coretraction,* $g : c \to b, s : c \to a \oplus t$ *are some morphisms with* $c \in \operatorname{Obj} A$ *and* $\operatorname{Cone}(s) \in D$.

Proof. Note first that by Theorem 1.2.2(1), f can be presented as the composition $x \circ y^{-1}$, where $x \in \underline{C}(T, b), y \in \underline{C}(T, a)$, $\operatorname{Cone}(y) \in D$, for some $T = T^0 \xrightarrow{d} T^1 \in K^b(A)^{[0,1]}$.

Now consider the composition $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where $i : a \to T^1 \oplus a$ is the canonical coretraction, $s : T^0 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d \\ -y^0 \end{pmatrix}} T^1 \oplus a$, $g = x^0 : T^0 \to b$. Note that s is invertible in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ since its cone is isomorphic to the cone of y. Next, applying Proposition 2.1.1 to the composition $(g \circ s^{-1}) \circ (i \circ id_a^{-1})$ we obtain that this composition is equal to $g_h \circ s_h^{-1}$ where $s_h \in \underline{C}(T', a)$, $g_h \in \underline{C}(T', b)$, $s_h^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & id_a \end{pmatrix}$, $g_h^0 = \begin{pmatrix} x^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and

$$T' = T^0 \oplus a \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d & 0 \\ -y^0 & id_a \end{pmatrix}} T^1 \oplus a.$$

Note that $s_h = \begin{pmatrix} y^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ in $\underline{C}$; the equality comes from the homotopy given by the morphism $T'^1 = T^1 \oplus a \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & id_a \end{pmatrix}} a$.

Consider $q : T \to T'$, $q^0 = \begin{pmatrix} id_{T^0} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $q^1 = \begin{pmatrix} id_{T^1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Obviously, it is a morphism of complexes. Note that $s_h \circ q = y$, $g_h \circ q = x$. Hence $f = x \circ y^{-1} = g_h \circ q \circ q^{-1} \circ s_h^{-1} = g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$.

□

Remark 2.1.3. 1. One can express the decomposition coming from Proposition 2.1.2 by an explicit formula: for a morphism $x \circ y^{-1}$, where $x : T \to b$, $y : T \to a$, $T \in \underline{C}^{[0,1]}$, $a, b, \in \operatorname{Obj} A$, and $\operatorname{Cone}(y) \in \operatorname{Obj} D$, consider

$$s = \begin{pmatrix} d \\ -y^0 \end{pmatrix} : T^0 \to T^1 \oplus a,$$

$$i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ id_a \end{pmatrix} : a \to T^1 \oplus a,$$

$$g = x^0 : T^0 \to b.$$

The equality $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i = x \circ y^{-1}$ has been shown in the proof of loc. cit.

2. In order to finish the proof of Theorem 1.2.2(3) it remains to verify that any $s : c \to a \oplus t$ such that $\mathrm{Cone}(s) \in D$ becomes invertible in the 'minimal' category A_0 mentioned in the proof. Since this is equivalent to $\mathrm{Cone}(s)$ being zero in $K^b(A_0)$, it suffices to verify: any $d \in D$ is isomorphic to the cone of some A-morphism that becomes invertible in A_0. Since A_0 will not change if we replace S by the closure of $S \cup \mathrm{id}(\mathrm{Obj}\, A)$ in $\mathrm{Mor}(A)$ with respect to the direct sum operation, to this end it suffices to apply Proposition 2.1.5 below.

3. All of the results of this paper are self-dual. In particular, Proposition 2.1.2 also yields that every $f \in A[S^{-1}]_{add}(a, b)$ can be presented as the composition $p \circ s^{-1} \circ h$, where p is a retraction, $\mathrm{Cone}(s) \in D$.

Now we calculate D.

Proposition 2.1.4. *The objects of D are exactly those complexes that are isomorphic to the cones of lower triangular morphism matrices with elements of S on the diagonal i.e. it to complexes of the form*

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} S_j^{-1} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ f_{12} & s_1 & 0 & \dots \\ & & & \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ f_{1n} & f_{2n} & \dots & s_n \end{pmatrix}} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{n} S_j^{0} \tag{2}$$

for $n \geq 0$, $s_1, s_2, \dots s_n \in S$, $f_{kl} \in A(S_k^{-1}, S_l^0)$ for all $1 \leq k < l \leq n$.

Proof. Obviously, it suffices to prove: if t_1, t_2 are morphisms of the form (2), $\mathrm{Cone}(t_1) \to t \to \mathrm{Cone}(t_2) \to \mathrm{Cone}(t_1)[1]$ is a distinguished triangle, then t is isomorphic to the cone of another morphism of the form (2). The latter is obvious from the definition of cones (and distinguished triangles) in $K^b(A)$. $\square$

So, the following statement finishes the proof of Theorem 1.2.2(3).

Proposition 2.1.5. *Assume that S contains* $\mathrm{id}(\mathrm{Obj}\, A)$ *and is closed under the direct sum operation. Then any morphism of the form described in (2) becomes invertible in the category $A[S^{-1}]$.*

Proof. It suffices to verify that f can be presented as the composition of morphisms each of those is either invertible in $\mathrm{Mor}(A)$ or belongs to S. We prove the latter statement by induction on n (i.e. on the size of the matrix). It is obviously true for $n = 1$. Suppose, that it is fulfilled for $n = k \geq 1$.

Now we make the inductive step. We present an f of the form (2) for $n = k+1$ as a matrix $s = \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ g & s_n \end{pmatrix}$, where

$$t = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} S_j^{-1} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 & 0 & \dots \\ f_{12} & s_1 & 0 & \dots \\ \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ f_{1k} & f_{2k} & \dots & s_k \end{pmatrix}} \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} S_j^0,$$

$g = (f_{1n}, f_{2n}, \dots, f_{kn})$. Then $f = \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{id}_{S_n^0} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{id}_{\bigoplus_{j=1}^k S_j^{-1}} & 0 \\ f & \mathrm{id}_{S_n^0} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{id}_{\bigoplus_{j=1}^k S_j^{-1}} & 0 \\ 0 & s_n \end{pmatrix}$. Applying the inductive assumption to t we decompose as $e_1 \circ e_2 \circ \dots \circ e_m$ for some $m \geq 0$, $e_i \in S \cup \mathrm{Isom}(A)$. Then $\begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & \mathrm{id}_{S_n^0} \end{pmatrix} = (e_1 \bigoplus \mathrm{id}_{S_n^0}) \circ (e_2 \bigoplus \mathrm{id}_{S_n^0}) \circ \dots \circ (e_m \bigoplus \mathrm{id}_{S_n^0})$ is a composition of the type desired (note that $S \cup \mathrm{Isom}(A)$ is closed under the operation $- \bigoplus \mathrm{id}_{S_n^0}$). Now, the second matrix is invertible in A since $\begin{pmatrix} \mathrm{id}_{\bigoplus_{j=1}^k S_j^{-1}} & 0 \\ -g & \mathrm{id}_{S_n^0} \end{pmatrix}$ is its inverse; the third morphism belongs to S itself.

□

Remark 2.1.6. This result yields a way to relate the morphism s mentioned in Proposition 2.1.2 with S very explicitly. Indeed, we can assume that the complex T mentioned in the proof of loc. cit. is an extension in $C^b(A)$ (i.e. we do not identify homotopy equivalent morphisms of complexes!) of $\mathrm{Cone}(y)[-1]$ by a, whereas $\mathrm{Cone}(y)$ is a morphism as in (2). This gives us an explicit description of invertible morphisms that are needed for the decompositions in Proposition 2.1.2.

Hence Proposition 2.1.7 can be translated into certain explicit (though clumsy) matrix formulas that only mention A and S.

Now we describe the composition of morphisms in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$, their addition, and their equality in terms of A and D. Recall here that all morphisms whose cones belong to D become invertible in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (see Remark 2.1.3(2)); one can also describe all s_i in the formulas below using Remark 2.1.6.

By Proposition 2.1.2, any $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$-morphism can be presented as the composition $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$. Now we compute the basic categorical operations for morphisms presented in this form (so, one may say that we describe $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ 'in terms of generators and relations').

Proposition 2.1.7. *Let* $a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 \in \operatorname{Obj} A = \operatorname{Obj} A[S^{-1}]_{add}$. *Present the morphisms* $f_j \in \underline{C}/\underline{D}(a_j, b_j)$ *as* $f_j = g_j \circ s_j^{-1} \circ i_j$ *(for* $j = 1, 2$*). Here* $b_j, c_j, d_j \in \operatorname{Obj} A$, $g_j \in A(d_j, b_j)$, $s_j \in A(d_j, c_j)$, $\operatorname{Cone}(s_j) \in D$, $i_j \in A(a_j, c_j)$ *(we do not require* i_j *to be coretractions). Then the following statements are fulfilled.*

I $f_1 \oplus f_2 = (g_1 \oplus g_2) \circ (s_1 \oplus s_2)^{-1} \circ (i_1 \oplus i_2)$.

II Assume that $a_1 = b_2$. *Then* $f_1 \circ f_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_2 \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 \\ -i_2 \circ g_1 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$

III Let $a_1 = a_2 = a$, $b_1 = b_2 = b$. *Then the following results are valid.*

1. $f_1 + f_2 = \begin{pmatrix} g_1 & g_2 \end{pmatrix} \circ (s_1 \oplus s_2)^{-1} \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_1 \\ i_2 \end{pmatrix}$

2. Denote the morphism $\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0 \\ i_2 & 0 & s_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \underline{C}(a \oplus d_1 \oplus d_2, c_1 \oplus c_2)$ *by* r.

Then $f_1 = f_2$ *whenever there exist* $z, z', t_1, t_2 \in \operatorname{Obj} A$, $k_1 \in A(z, t_1)$, $k_2 \in A(t_2, z')$, $p \in A(z, t_2), g \in A(t_1, z'), \alpha_1^1 \in A(c_1 \oplus c_2, z'), \alpha_1^0 \in A(a \oplus d_1 \oplus d_2, t_1 \oplus t_2), \alpha_2 \in A(t_1 \oplus t_2, b)$, *and* $l \in A(c_1 \oplus c_2, b)$ *such that:* $\operatorname{Cone}(k_i) \in D$, $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2 \\ \begin{pmatrix} g & k_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1^0 & \begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_1 & -g_2 \end{pmatrix} + l \circ r & 0 \\ \alpha_1^1 \circ r & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof. I Immediate from the functoriality of the direct sum operation (note that the direct sum of invertible morphisms is invertible).

II By Lemma 2.1.1, $g_1 \circ s_1^{-1} \circ (i_1 \circ g_2) \circ s_2^{-1} = x \circ y^{-1}$, for $x \in \underline{C}(T, b_2)$, $y \in \underline{C}(T, c_1)$ such that $y^0 = \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $x^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_2 \end{pmatrix}$, and $T = d_1 \oplus d_2 \overset{\begin{pmatrix} i_2 \circ g_1 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}}{\rightarrow} c_2 \in \underline{C}^{[0,1]}$. By Remark 2.1.3(1), $x \circ y^{-1} = g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where

$$i = \begin{pmatrix} id_{c_1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : c_1 \to c_1 \oplus c_2,$$

$$s = \begin{pmatrix} -s_1 & 0 \\ i_2 \circ g_1 & s_2 \end{pmatrix} : d_1 \oplus d_2 \to c_1 \oplus c_2,$$

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_2 \end{pmatrix} : d_1 \oplus d_2 \to b_2.$$

So, $f_1 \circ f_2 = g_1 \circ s_1^{-1} \circ (i_1 \circ g_2) \circ s_2^{-1} \circ i_2 = g \circ s^{-1} \circ i \circ i_1 = g \circ (-id_{d_1} \oplus id_{d_2}) \circ (-id_{d_1} \oplus id_{d_2})^{-1} \circ s^{-1} \circ i \circ i_1$.

Writing above explicitly: $f_1 \circ f_2 = g \circ (-id_{d_1} \oplus id_{d_2}) \circ (s \circ (-id_{d_1} \oplus id_{d_2}))^{-1} \circ i \circ i_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_2 \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 \\ -i_2 \circ g_1 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

III1. $f_1+f_2=\begin{pmatrix} id_b & id_b\end{pmatrix}\circ f_1\oplus f_2\circ\begin{pmatrix} id_a\\ id_a\end{pmatrix}$. Applying assertion I, we transform this into $\begin{pmatrix} id_b & id_b\end{pmatrix}\circ g_1\oplus g_2\circ(s_1\oplus s_2)^{-1}\circ i_1\oplus i_2\circ\begin{pmatrix} id_a\\ id_a\end{pmatrix}=\begin{pmatrix} g_1 & g_2\end{pmatrix}\circ(s_1\oplus s_2)^{-1}\circ\begin{pmatrix} i_1\\ i_2\end{pmatrix}$.

2. By the previous assertion, $f_1-f_2=\begin{pmatrix} g_1 & -g_2\end{pmatrix}\circ(s_1\oplus s_2)^{-1}\circ\begin{pmatrix} i_1\\ i_2\end{pmatrix}$. Let

$$T=a\oplus d_1\oplus d_2\overset{\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0\\ i_2 & 0 & s_2\end{pmatrix}}{\to}c_1\oplus c_2,$$

$x=\begin{pmatrix}0 & g_1 & -g_2\end{pmatrix}\in\underline{C}(T,b)$, $y=\begin{pmatrix} id_a & 0 & 0\end{pmatrix}$. By Lemma 2.1.1, f_1-f_2 equals $x\circ y^{-1}$. Applying Theorem 1.2.2(1) we obtain that $x\circ y^{-1}=0$ whenever x factorizes through some $T'\in\operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$ that can be presented as a cone of a $\underline{C}$-morphism between two elements of $D[-1]$. Hence $f_1=f_2$ whenever there exist $z,z',t_1,t_2\in\operatorname{Obj}A$, $k_1\in A(z,t_1)$, $k_2\in A(t_2,z')$, $p\in A(z,t_2)$, $g\in A(t_1,z')$ such that: $\operatorname{Cone}(k_i)\in D$, $\begin{pmatrix} g & k_2\end{pmatrix}\circ\begin{pmatrix} k_1\\ p\end{pmatrix}=0$, and

$$T'=z\overset{\begin{pmatrix} k_1\\ p\end{pmatrix}}{\to}t_1\oplus t_2\overset{\begin{pmatrix} g & k_2\end{pmatrix}}{\to}z'.$$

It remains to rewrite these conditions in a more explicit form. We choose some factorization of x through T' in $\underline{C}$: $T\overset{\alpha_1}{\to}T'\overset{\alpha_2}{\to}b$. We put these morphisms into a diagram whose rows are T,T',b, respectively:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & a\oplus d_1\oplus d_2 \arrow[rr, "{\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0\\ i_2 & 0 & s_2\end{pmatrix}}"] \arrow[d, "\alpha_1^0"] & & c_1\oplus c_2 \arrow[d, "\alpha_1^1"] \\
z \arrow[r, "{\begin{pmatrix} k_1\\ p\end{pmatrix}}"] \arrow[d] & t_1\oplus t_2 \arrow[rr, "{\begin{pmatrix} g & k_2\end{pmatrix}}"] \arrow[d, "\alpha_2"] & & z' \\
0 \arrow[r] & b & &
\end{tikzcd}\tag{3}$$

The diagram yields $\begin{pmatrix} g & k_2\end{pmatrix}\circ\alpha_1^0=\alpha_1^1\circ\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0\\ i_2 & 0 & s_2\end{pmatrix}$ and $\alpha_2\circ\begin{pmatrix} k_1\\ p\end{pmatrix}=0$.

The equality $\alpha_1\circ\alpha_2=x\in\underline{C}$ means that for their difference in $C^b(A)$ there exists a cochain homotopy. We denote the only possible non-zero component of the latter by l (note that $b \in \underline{C}^{[0,0]}$); so we have $l \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_1 & k_1 & 0 \\ i_2 & 0 & k_2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_1 & -g_2 \end{pmatrix} = \alpha_2 \circ \alpha_1^0$.

Summarizing all the assumptions made and writing the equalities in the matrix form we obtain the result.

□

2.2 The comparison of our results with the theory of Cohn's localizations

We recall the setting of the 'classical' theory of non-commutative localizations of rings (see [Coh85]). The authors apologize for not being able to mention all significant contributions to this vast subject.

One considers a set M of matrices over an (associative unitial) ring R and looks for an initial object in the category of ring homomorphisms $R \to R'$ such that all elements of M become invertible over R'. More generally, instead of matrices one can consider morphisms $P_i \to Q_i$ of finitely generated projective R-modules and tensor them by R' (see [Sch85]).

Denote by A the category of finitely generated free (resp. projective) left modules over R. It is easily seen that the problem of finding the ring R' is 'equivalent' to the calculation of $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$. Indeed, denote R considered as a module over itself by $\mathcal{R}$; then any object of A is isomorphic to the direct sum of a finite number of copies of $\mathcal{R}$ (resp. to a retract of such a direct sum). It follows that the image of $\mathcal{R}$ in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ also is a 'generator' i.e. that the objects of $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ are exactly the direct sums of (a finite number of) copies of $\mathcal{R}$ (resp. are some retracts of such direct sums). Hence the 'universal' localization R' of R as mentioned above is naturally isomorphic to $\operatorname{End}_{A[S^{-1}]_{add}} \mathcal{R}$.

Now, for any additive A one can consider the rings $R_I = \operatorname{End}_A(\bigoplus_{a \in I} a)$ where I runs through all finite subsets of $\operatorname{Obj} A$. If A is Karoubian, this yields its presentation as the projective limit of the categories of finitely generated projective modules over R_I. So, it is no surprise that our 'explicit' description of $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is closely related with the description of the universal localization of R given in [Ger82] and [Mal82]. Moreover, they can probably be deduced from the results of ibid. and [Sch85] (via passing to the limit) in the case of a Karoubian A; the extension to the case of a non-Karoubian category could be more difficult. Note also that (to the knowledge of the authors) our paper is the first one in which 'additive localizations' are compared with 'abstract' ones.

Another advantage of our methods is that we define $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ as a full subcategory of $K^b(A)/\underline{D}$. So, we do not have to verify that our presentation of morphisms and the relations on them (see Proposition 2.1.7) does yield an additive category indeed (in contrast with the arguments of [Ger82] and [Mal82]). Also, the consideration of $K^b(A)/\underline{D}$ explain the origin of the relations obtained (their analogues in the papers cited look quite ad hoc). In particular, the *multiplicativity* condition for M in [Mal82] corresponds to the extension-closedness of our D (cf. (2)). Besides, one can easily note that Theorem 1.2.2 yields a mighty tool for computations in $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (we thoroughly demonstrated this in the previous paragraph).

We will relate our methods and results with the 'alternative triangulated approach to additive localizations' of [NeR04] and [Dwy06] in §3.3 below. Here we only note that non-commutative localizations seem to be really nicely related with weight structures (that we will treat in the next section). Certainly, one of the reasons to say this is Theorem 3.2.1 below. We would also like to say that though Proposition 1.1.3 (that is crucial for this paper) was not formulated in the terms of weight structures, it is certainly closely related with them. In particular, part 1 of the Proposition is a modification of the axiom 3.1.1(Iiv), whereas the formulations of parts 2–4 are motivated by Remark 1.1.4(1).

3 On weight structures in localizations

We start this section by recalling the definition and basic properties of weight structures. They enable us to generalize the results of the previous sections and prove for $S \subset \operatorname{Mor} \underline{Hw}$: $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ is endowed with a weight structure whose heart is the Karoubization of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. Next we recall the notion of adjacent structures; we prove (in the case of a certain compactly generated $\underline{\mathcal{D}} \subset \underline{C}$) that $\underline{C}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ possesses a t-structure *adjacent* to $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}}$ and calculate its heart.

3.1 A reminder on weight structures

Definition 3.1.1. I A pair of subclasses $\underline{C}_{w\le 0}, \underline{C}_{w\ge 0} \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ will be said to define a weight structure w for a triangulated category $\underline{C}$ if they satisfy the following conditions:

(i) $\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}, \underline{C}_{w\le 0}$ are Karoubi-closed in $\underline{C}$ (i.e. contain all $\underline{C}$-retracts of their objects).

(ii) **Semi-invariance with respect to translations.**
$\underline{C}_{w\le 0} \subset \underline{C}_{w\le 0}[1]$, $\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}[1] \subset \underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$.

(iii) **Orthogonality.**

$\underline{C}_{w\le 0} \perp \underline{C}_{w\ge 0}[1]$.

(iv) **Weight decompositions**.

For any $M \in \operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$ there exists a distinguished triangle

$$X \to M \to Y \to X[1] \tag{4}$$

such that $X \in \underline{C}_{w\le 0}$, $Y \in \underline{C}_{w\ge 0}[1]$.

II The category $\underline{Hw} \subset \underline{C}$ whose objects are $\underline{C}_{w=0} = \underline{C}_{w\ge 0} \cap \underline{C}_{w\le 0}$, $\underline{Hw}(Z,T) = \underline{C}(Z,T)$ for $Z,T \in \underline{C}_{w=0}$, will be called the *heart* of w.

III $\underline{C}_{w\ge i}$ (resp. $\underline{C}_{w\le i}$, resp. $\underline{C}_{w=i}$) will denote $\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}[i]$ (resp. $\underline{C}_{w\le 0}[i]$, resp. $\underline{C}_{w=0}[i]$).

IV We denote $\underline{C}_{w\ge i} \cap \underline{C}_{w\le j}$ by $\underline{C}_{[i,j]}$ (so it equals $\{0\}$ for $i > j$).

V We will say that $(\underline{C}, w)$ is *bounded* if $\cup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\underline{C}_{w\le i} = \operatorname{Obj}\underline{C} = \cup_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\underline{C}_{w\ge i}$.

VI Let $\underline{C}$ and $\underline{C}'$ will be triangulated categories endowed with weight structures w and w', respectively; let $F : \underline{C} \to \underline{C}'$ be an exact functor.

F will be called *left weight-exact* (with respect to w, w') if it maps $\underline{C}_{w\le 0}$ into $\underline{C}'_{w'\le 0}$; it will be called *right weight-exact* if it maps $\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$ into $\underline{C}'_{w'\ge 0}$. F is called *weight-exact* if it is both left and right weight-exact.

VII Let H be a full subcategory of a triangulated $\underline{C}$.

We will say that H is *negative* if $\operatorname{Obj} H \perp (\cup_{i>0} \operatorname{Obj}(H[i]))$.

VIII The *small envelope* of an additive category A is the category $A' \subset \operatorname{Kar}(A)$ whose objects are (X,p) for $X \in \operatorname{Obj} A$ and $p \in A(X,X)$ such that $p^2 = p$ and there exist $Y \in \operatorname{Obj} A$ and $q \in A(X,Y)$, $s \in A(Y,X)$ satisfying $sq = 1 - p$, $qs = \mathrm{id}_Y$. Certainly, A'-morphism groups are given by the standard formula for $\operatorname{Kar}(A)$:

$$A'((X,p),(X',p')) = \{f \in A(X,X') : \ p'f = fp = f\}. \tag{5}$$

Remark 3.1.2. 1. A simple (and yet very useful for us) example of a weight structure comes from the stupid filtration on $K^b(A)$ (or for $K(A)$) for an arbitrary additive A. In this case $K^b(A)_{w\le 0}$ (resp. $K^b(A)_{w\ge 0}$) will be the class of complexes that are homotopy equivalent to complexes concentrated in degrees ≥ 0 (resp. ≤ 0). The heart of this weight structure is the Karoubi-closure of A in $K^b(A)$. Note that we have $K^b(A)^{[-j,-i]} \subset K^b(A)_{[i,j]}$ for any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$; we have an equality if A is Karoubian, but in general $K^b(A)_{[0,0]}$ is the small envelope of A (so it is not necessarily equivalent to A; cf. Proposition 3.1.3(7)).

3. A weight decomposition (of any $M \in \operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$) is (almost) never canonical.

4. In the current paper we use the 'homological convention' for weight structures; it was previously used in [Heb11], [Wil09], and [Bon12], whereas in [Bon10a] and in [Bon10b] the 'cohomological convention' was used. In

the latter convention the roles of $\underline{C}_{w\le 0}$ and $\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$ are interchanged i.e. one considers $\underline{C}^{w\le 0}=\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$ and $\underline{C}^{w\ge 0}=\underline{C}_{w\le 0}$. So, a complex $X\in \operatorname{Obj} K(A)$ whose only non-zero term is the fifth one (i.e. $X^5\neq 0$) has weight -5 in the homological convention, and has weight 5 in the cohomological convention. Thus the conventions differ by 'signs of weights'; $K(A)_{[i,j]}$ is the class of retracts of complexes concentrated in degrees $[-j,-i]$.

5. The orthogonality axiom in Definition 3.1.1(I) immediately yields that $\underline{Hw}$ is negative in $\underline{C}$. We will recall a certain converse statement below.

Now we recall those properties of weight structures that will be needed below (and that can be easily formulated). We will not mention more complicated matters (weight spectral sequences and weight complexes) here.

Proposition 3.1.3. *Let $\underline{C}$ be a triangulated category; we will assume it to be endowed with a weight structure w everywhere except assertions 1 and 7.*

1. *(C_1,C_2) ($C_1,C_2\subset \operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$) define a weight structure for $\underline{C}$ whenever (C_2^{op},C_1^{op}) define a weight structure for $\underline{C}^{op}$.*

2. *$\underline{C}_{w\le 0}$, $\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$, and $\underline{C}_{w=0}$ are extension-stable.*

3. *For any weight decomposition of $M\in \underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$ (see (4)) we have $X\in \underline{C}_{w=0}$.*

4. *w restricts to a bounded weight structure on $\underline{C}^b$; the heart of this weight structure equals $\underline{Hw}$.*

5. *If w is bounded, then $\underline{C}$ is generated by $\underline{C}_{w=0}$ (as a triangulated category).*

6. *$\underline{C}_{[0,1]}$ consists exactly of cones of morphisms in $\underline{Hw}$.*

7. *Let $H\subset \operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$ be negative, additive, and generate $\underline{C}$. Then there exists a unique weight structure w for $\underline{C}$ such that $H\subset \underline{C}_{w=0}$. It is bounded; its heart is equivalent to the small envelope of H.*

   Moreover, $\underline{C}_{w\le 0}$ is the smallest Karoubi-closed extension-stable subclass of $\operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$ containing $\cup_{i\le 0}\operatorname{Obj} H[i]$; $\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$ is the smallest Karoubi-closed extension-stable subclass of $\operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$ containing $\cup_{i\ge 0}\operatorname{Obj} H[i]$.

8. *Let $\underline{C}$ be endowed with a bounded weight structure w. Then there exists a unique weight structure w' for the Karoubization $\underline{C}'$ of $\underline{C}$ such that the embedding $\underline{C}\to\underline{C}'$ is weight-exact. It is bounded; its heart is the Karoubization of $\underline{Hw}$.*

9. *A certain additive weak weight complex functor* $t : \underline{C} \to K_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{Hw})$ *is defined, where* $K_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{Hw})$ *is a certain weak homotopy category of complexes.* t *and* $K_{\mathfrak{w}}(-)$ *satisfy the following properties.*

   (i) For any additive A *we have: there is a natural conservative additive functor* $p(A) : K(A) \to K_{\mathfrak{w}}(A)$ *that is bijective on objects and surjective on morphisms.* p *commutes with* $[i]$ *for any* $i \in \mathbb{Z}$*; we have* $K(A)(X,Y) \cong K_w(A)(p(X),p(Y))$ *for any* $X \in K(A)^{\le 0}$*,* $Y \in K(A)^{\ge 0}$*.*

   (ii) There also exists a certain bounded analogue $K^b_{\mathfrak{w}}(-) \subset K_{\mathfrak{w}}(-)$*. If* w *is bounded then* t *is conservative and can be factorized through* $K^b_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{Hw})$*.*

   (iii) If $X[-1] \to Y \xrightarrow{f} Z \to X$ *is a distinguished triangle in* $\underline{C}$ *then there exists a lift of* $t(f)$ *to a* $t'(f) \in K(A)(t(Y),t(Z))$ *such that* $t(X) \cong \mathrm{Cone}(t'(f))$*.*

   (iv) Let $S = \{S_i^{-1} \xrightarrow{s_i} S_i^0,\ i \in I\} \subset \mathrm{Mor}\,\underline{Hw}$*,* $B \subset \underline{C}_{[0,1]}$ *is the set of cones of elements of* S *(see assertion 6),* D *is the extension-closure of* F*. Then* $D \subset \underline{C}_{[0,1]}$*;* $t(D)$ *consists of cones of morphisms given by lower triangular matrices with elements of* S *on the diagonal; see (2).*

10. *Let* w *be bounded; let* w' *be a weight structure for a triangulated* $\underline{C}'$*. Then an exact functor* $F : \underline{C} \to \underline{C}'$ *is weight-exact whenever* $F(\underline{C}_{w=0}) \subset \underline{C}_{w'=0}$*.*

Proof. All of these statements except two last ones were essentially proved in [Bon10a] (pay attention to Remark 3.1.2(4)!); see Remark 1.1.2(1), Proposition 1.3.3(3,6), Proposition 1.3.6(2), Corollary 1.5.7, Proposition 1.5.6(2), Theorem 4.3.2(II), and Proposition 5.2.2 of ibid., respectively.

Part (i) of assertion 9 is immediate from the definition of $K_w(-)$ (this is Definition 3.1.6 of ibid.). Part (ii) follows from Theorem 3.3.1(I,V) of ibid. Part (iii) of assertion 9 is also an easy consequence of the *weak exactness* of t (see loc. cit.); it implies part (iv) immediately (cf. Proposition 2.1.4).

Lastly, assertion 10 is an easy consequence of assertion 7.

□

3.2 The relation of weight structures with 'additive localizations'

Now we prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.2.1. *Let* w *be a weight structure for* $\underline{C}$*,* $B \subset \underline{C}_{[0,1]}$*; adopt the notation of Proposition 1.1.3. Then the following statements are valid.*

1. The Karoubi-closures of the sets $(\underline{C}_{w\le 0},\underline{C}_{w\ge 0})$ *in* $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ *yield a weight structure* $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ *for* $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ *(such that the localization functor is weight-exact).*

2. $\underline{Hw}_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ *is the Karoubization in* $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ *of the full subcategory* H *of* $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ *whose objects are* $\underline{C}_{w=0}$*.*

3. If w *is bounded, then* $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ *also is; its heart is the small envelope of* H*.*

4. Let S *denote some set of* $\underline{Hw}$*-morphisms such that* B *consists exactly of cones of elements of* S *(see Proposition 3.1.3(6)). Then* H *is canonically isomorphic to* $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$*.*

Proof. 1. We should verify that the Karoubi-closures of $(\underline{C}_{w\ge 0},\underline{C}_{w\le 0})$ satisfy all the axioms of weight structures.

They are obviously semi-invariant with respect to translations. The orthogonality axiom follows from Proposition 1.1.3(4) easily (cf. Remark 1.1.4(1)); it suffices to note that $\underline{C}_{w\le 0}\perp\underline{C}_{w\ge 1}\supset B_{\ge 1}$, and $B_{\le -1}\subset\underline{C}_{\le 0}\perp\underline{C}_{w\ge 1}$ (in $\underline{C}$; by Definition 3.1.1(Iiii)). Lastly, any object of $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ possesses a weight decomposition that comes from $\underline{C}$.

2. $\underline{C}_{w=0}\subset(\underline{C}/\underline{D})_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}=0}$ by the definition of $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$.

Now we prove that any object of $(\underline{C}/\underline{D})_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}=0}$ is a retract of an object of $\underline{C}_{w=0}$ (in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$). Actually, this fact is valid for any weight-exact functor that is surjective on objects.

We repeat an argument used in §8.1 of [Bon10a]. Let $Z\in\underline{C}/\underline{D}_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}=0}\subset\operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}$. Shifting a weight decomposition of $Z[1]$ in $\underline{C}$ by $[-1]$ we obtain a distinguished triangle $T\to Z\to U$ with $T\in\underline{C}_{w\le -1}$, $U\in\underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$. In $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ we have $T\in\underline{C}/\underline{D}_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}\le -1}$; hence $T\perp Z$ and we obtain that $U\cong_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}Z\bigoplus T[1]$. Therefore, in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ the object Z is a retract of U, whereas $U\in\underline{C}/\underline{D}_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}=0}\cap\underline{C}_{w\le 0}$.

Now applying the dual argument to U (see Proposition 3.1.3(1)), we obtain that U in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ is a retract of some $W\in\operatorname{Obj}\underline{C}_{w=0}$ (here $W\to U\to Y$ is a weight decomposition in $\underline{C}$; we apply part 3 of loc. cit.).

3. Since the localization functor is weight-exact, $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ is bounded. Next, we have $H\subset\underline{Hw}$; hence H is negative (see Remark 3.1.2(5)). Proposition 3.1.3(2) yields that $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ is the weight structure corresponding to H via assertion 7 of loc. cit. Hence the assertion mentioned yields the result.

4. We follow the scheme of the proof of Theorem 1.2.2(3). First we prove that any additive functor $F:\underline{Hw}\to A$ that converts all elements of S into invertible morphisms factorizes through the functor $u:\underline{Hw}\to H$ (actually, it suffices to verify this for F being the localization functor $\underline{Hw}\to\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$).

We consider the composition $G=K_{\mathfrak{w}}(F)\circ t:\underline{C}\to K_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add})$. Obviously, it suffices to verify that G factorizes through the localization functor $\underline{C}\to\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. By the universal property of 'abstract' localizations, it suffices to verify for any distinguished triangle $X \to Y \xrightarrow{f} Z \to X[1]$ that $G(f)$ is an isomorphism if $X \in \operatorname{Obj}\langle B\rangle$. By Proposition 3.1.3(9(iii)) to this end it suffices to verify that $G(X) = 0$ for such an X. Since G is additive, it suffices to verify that it kills all objects of $\underline{D}$. Applying loc. cit. again (repeatedly) we reduce this to the fact that it kills all objects of B. The latter is obvious since all objects of B die in $K(\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add})$, whereas morphism groups in $K(\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add})$ surject onto those in $K_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add})$.

By Theorem 1.2.2(3), there exists a unique additive functor $R : \underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add} \to H$ compatible with u that is bijective on objects. Since there also is a functor in the inverse direction (as we have just proved), R is injective on morphisms.

As is the proof of loc. cit., it remains to verify that there are no 'redundant' morphisms in H. Hence we should extend Remark 2.1.3(2) to this setting. To this end it suffices to note: Proposition 3.1.3(9) allows to reduce this extended version of the remark to the setting considered in §2.1 (for $A = \underline{Hw}$).

□

Remark 3.2.2. 1. Strictly speaking, our Theorem as stated is not a generalization of Theorem 1.2.2(3), since A is not necessarily equivalent to the heart of the 'stupid' weight structure (for $K^b(A)$ or $K(A)$; see Proposition 3.1.3(7). So, we generalize Theorem 3.2.1(4) to the following statement (we use the notation of loc. cit).

2. For an additive $A \subset \underline{Hw}$ assume that $S \subset \operatorname{Mor}(A)$ and $\underline{Hw} = \operatorname{Kar}_{\underline{C}} A$. Then there exists a unique weight structure $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ for $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ such that the localization functor is weight-exact and yields an isomorphism of $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ with the full subcategory $H' \subset \underline{Hw}_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}} :\ \operatorname{Obj} H' = A$.

Indeed, it suffices to note: the universality properties of the additive localization construction (given Theorem 1.2.2(3)) and of the Karoubization one yield a canonical sequence of functors $A[S^{-1}]_{add} \to \underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add} \to \operatorname{Kar}(A[S^{-1}]_{add}) \to \operatorname{Kar}(\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add})$. Hence $A[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is a full subcategory of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$.

3. For $\underline{C}$ possessing a differential graded enhancement ('compatible with w') one can verify the existence of $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ 'explicitly'; cf. §8.2 of [Bon09]. Yet it seems hard to compute $\underline{Hw}_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ via calculations of this sort.

4. Our theorem extends the results of §8.1 of [Bon10a] where the case $B \subset \underline{C}_{w=0}$ was considered.

Note that our setting reduces to this one if all the elements of S are retractions.

3.3 The relation with adjacent t-structures

Now we discuss certain 'triangulated' methods used in [Dwy06] and in [NeR04] for the study of non-commutative localizations. These papers mostly treat the setting of finitely generated projective modules over a ring R (though in §4 of [Dwy06] also arbitrary small additive categories were considered; see Remark 3.3.4 below). In this setting the non-commutative localization ring $R[S^{-1}]$ was presented as the endomorphism ring of $\mathcal{R}$ (this is the image of R considered as an R-module) in a certain localization $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ of $D(R)$. One of important tools for the papers cited is the fact that the canonical t-structure for $D(R)$ yields a t-structure for $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ (via the embedding functor $G : \underline{\mathcal{E}} \to D(R)$ defined as in Theorem 3.3.3 below); see Proposition 3.4 of [Dwy06] and Lemma 6.3 of [NeR04].

Now we relate our approach for constructing additive localizations with the ones of the papers cited. The first trivial remark is: for H being the category of finitely generated projective R-modules we certainly have an embedding $K^b(H) \to D(R)$. An obvious advantage of our methods is that $K^b(H)$ is 'much smaller', whereas Theorem 1.2.2 makes explicit computations in $K^b(H)/\underline{D}$ quite easy. Note in contrast that no attempt was made in [Dwy06] and [NeR04] to 'calculate $R[S^{-1}]$ explicitly' (i.e. to reprove the results of [Ger82] and [Mal82]). Besides, to the belief of the authors, it is easier to deal with the functor $K^b(F)$ for an additive $F : H \to A$ than with functors of the type $- \otimes_R R'$ for a ring homomorphism $R \to R'$.

Now we try to explain the relation of our 'weight structure' approach with the 't-structure one'. Our reasoning yields certain t-structure results for a wide class of triangulated categories (and their localizations).

The relation between weight and t-structures that is relevant for us (in this paper) is the notion of *adjacent structures*. Some basic definitions of this theory can be found in §4.1 of [Bon10c], whereas several more results are stated and proved in §§4.4-4.5 of [Bon10a] (yet pay attention to Remark 3.1.2 above!). The idea is to axiomatize (and generalize) the 'duality' between the category A of projective R-modules and the category $\underline{A}$ of all R-modules. The 'triangulated avatar' of this duality is the fact that any object of $D(R)^{t\le 0}$ has a projective (hyper)resolution (t is the canonical t-structure for $\underline{C} = D^-(R)$); so $\underline{C}^{t\le 0} = \underline{C}_{w\ge 0}$, where w is the 'stupid' weight structure coming from the isomorphism $\underline{C} \cong K^-(A)$. Note however: in this example we have $\underline{Hw} \subset \underline{Ht}$; yet we do not have such an inclusion for a general pair of adjacent w, t.

First we recall some well-known definitions. For simplicity, till the end of the paragraph we will assume that $\underline{C}$ is closed under arbitrary small coproducts (though for our purposes it is also possible to consider coproducts for sets of objects of limited cardinality only; cf. Theorem 4.3.2(III(i)) of ibid.) everywhere expect assertions I and II of Proposition 3.3.2. In such a situation an $X \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ is called compact if the functor $\underline{C}(X, -)$ commutes with all coproducts.

For a $B \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}$ we will say that B *weakly generates* $\underline{C}$ if $(\cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} B[i])^{\perp} = \{0\}$.

For a small additive A we denote by $\operatorname{AddFun}(A, Ab)$ the category of additive functors from A to the category of abelian groups.

We will say that a t-structure t (for $\underline{C}$) is non-degenerate if $\cap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{C}^{t \leq n} = \cap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{C}^{t \geq n} = \{0\}$. $\underline{Ht}$ is the heart of t.

Definition 3.3.1. We say that a weight structure w for $\underline{C}$ is (left) *adjacent* to a t-structure t for it if $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0} = \underline{C}^{t \leq 0}$.

We will also need the following properties of adjacent structures and compactly generated categories.

Proposition 3.3.2. *I Let $\underline{C}$ be endowed with a weight structure w and also with an adjacent t-structure t (we do not assume that all small coproducts exist in $\underline{C}$ in this assertion).*

1. Let $\underline{C}$ be small. Then the functor $\underline{C}(\underline{Hw}, -) : \underline{Ht} \to \operatorname{AddFun}(\underline{Hw}^{op}, Ab)$ that sends $N \in \underline{C}^{t=0}$ to $M \mapsto \underline{C}(M, N)$ $(M \in \underline{C}_{w=0})$, is an exact embedding of $\underline{Ht}$ into the abelian category $\operatorname{AddFun}(\underline{Hw}^{op}, Ab)$.

2. Let t be non-degenerate. Then $\underline{C}^{t \leq 0} = \{M \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C} :\ \underline{C}_{w=i} \perp M\ \forall\, i < 0\}$; $\underline{C}^{t \geq 0} = \{M \in \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C} :\ \underline{C}_{w=i} \perp M\ \forall\, i > 0\}$.

II Moreover, let a triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ be endowed with a weight structure $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ and also with its adjacent t-structure $t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$. Let $\pi : \underline{C} \to \underline{\mathcal{E}}$ be an exact functor. Then the following statements are valid.

1. π is right weight-exact whenever it is right t-exact (i.e. if $\pi(\underline{C}^{t \leq 0}) \subset \underline{\mathcal{E}}^{t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}} \leq 0}$).

2. Let $G : \underline{\mathcal{E}} \to \underline{C}$ be the right adjoint to π. Then π is right (resp. left) weight-exact with respect to w and $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ whenever G is left (resp. right) t-exact with respect to $t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ and t.

III Let $\underline{C}'$ be a full triangulated subcategory of $\underline{C}$ whose objects are compact; let $B \subset \operatorname{Obj} \underline{C}'$ be a (proper) set (i.e. it is small); let $H \subset \underline{C}'$ be a small additive category such that $\operatorname{Obj} H$ weakly generates $\underline{C}$. Then the following statements are valid.

1. Denote by $\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ the smallest triangulated subcategory of $\underline{C}$ that contains B and is closed with respect to all small coproducts. Then $\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ is Karoubian and is weakly generated by B.

2. The Verdier localization category $\underline{\mathcal{E}} = \underline{C}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ exists. The localization functor $\pi : \underline{C} \to \underline{\mathcal{E}}$ commutes with all coproducts, converts compact objects *into compact ones, and possesses a right adjoint G that is a full embedding functor. Besides, $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ is weakly generated by $\pi(\operatorname{Obj} H)$; it is Karoubian.*

3. π induces a full embedding of $\underline{E} = \underline{C}'/\langle B\rangle_{\underline{C}'}$ into $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$.

4. Assume moreover that H is negative (see Definition 3.1.1(VII)). Then $\underline{C}$ possesses a weight structure w whose heart is equivalent to the Karoubization of the category of all coproducts of objects of H, and also a non-degenerate adjacent t-structure t. Besides, $\underline{Hw}$ is the Karoubization of the category of all ('formal' small) coproducts of objects of H, whereas $\underline{Ht} \cong \operatorname{AddFun}(H^{op}, Ab)$ (via the functor $N \mapsto (h \in \operatorname{Obj} H \mapsto \underline{C}(h, N))$).

Proof. I Assertion 1 is exactly part 4 of Theorem 4.4.2 of [Bon10a]; it easily implies assertion 2 (which one can reduce to the case of a small $\underline{C}$).

II1. Immediate from the definition of adjacent structures.

2. See Remark 4.4.6 of ibid.

III 1–3: These statements easily follow from the results of [Nee01] (see Corollary 3.2.11, Theorem 8.4.4, and Proposition 9.1.19 on Bousfield localizations); see also Corollary 3.7 of [NeR04]. Theorem A of [Kra01] (and its proof) relates Neeman's definition of generators with ours of weak generators.

4. Immediate from Theorem 4.5.2 of [Bon10a].

□

One may say that part II2 of this Proposition settles the difficulties caused by the fact that the (left) adjoint to a t-exact functor is usually not t-exact.

Now we formulate the main result of this paragraph.

Theorem 3.3.3. *Let $\underline{C}, \underline{C}', B, H, \underline{\mathcal{D}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}}, \pi, G, \underline{E}$ be as in Proposition 3.3.2(III) (and satisfy all the conditions mentioned in this assertion). Assume moreover that B consists of cones of a set $S \subset \operatorname{Mor} H$, and that H generates $\underline{C}'$. Then the following statements are fulfilled.*

1. $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ possesses a weight structure $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ and also a non-degenerate adjacent t-structure $t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$.

2. $H[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is a full additive subcategory of $\underline{Hw}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ (via π); $\underline{Hw}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ is equivalent to the Karoubization of the category of all small coproducts of objects of $H[S^{-1}]_{add}$.

3. $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ restricts to a weight structure for $\underline{E} \subset \underline{\mathcal{E}}$.

4. G is t-exact; π is weight-exact.

5. $\underline{Ht}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ is equivalent to $\operatorname{AddFun}(H[S^{-1}]_{add}^{op}, Ab)$. It is a full exact abelian subcategory of $\underline{Ht}$ (via G); a functor I belongs to $G(\underline{Ht}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}})$ whenever $I(s)$ is bijective for any $s \in S$.

Proof. Remark 3.2.2(2) yields that the full subcategory of $\underline{E}$ whose objects are those of H is isomorphic to $H[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (this is the first part of our assertion

2), and is negative in $\underline{E} \subset \underline{\mathcal{E}}$. Hence Proposition 3.3.2(III) yields that $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 3.3.2(III4) with $H[S^{-1}]_{add}$ instead of H. Thus our assertion 1, the rest of assertion 2, and the first part of assertion 5 follow from loc.cit.

Now, Remark 3.2.2(2) also yields the existence of a weight structure for $\underline{E}$ whose heart is $\mathrm{Kar}_{\underline{E}}(H[S^{-1}]_{add})$; it is compatible with $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ by Proposition 3.1.3(10). Thus we proved assertion 3.

Next, since π commutes with all coproducts, we obtain that $\pi(\underline{C}_{w=0}) \subset \underline{\mathcal{E}}_{w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}=0}$. Hence Proposition 3.3.2(I2) yields the t-exactness of G. Applying part II2 of loc. cit. we also obtain that π is weight-exact; this finishes the proof of assertion 4.

The second part of assertion 5 is given by the t-exactness of G. In order to verify its last part it suffices to note that an $I \in \mathrm{AddFun}(H^{op}, Ab)$ factorizes through $H[S^{-1}]_{add}$ whenever it converts all $s \in S$ into bijections.

□

Now we make some more remarks on the relations of our results with those of [Dwy06] and [NeR04].

Remark 3.3.4. 1. It is easy to construct a $\underline{C}$ for any small H. To this end, following §4 of [Dwy06] one can consider the derived category of $\mathrm{AddFun}(H^{op}, Ab)$. Note that we have $\underline{Hw} \subset \underline{Ht}$ for this category (yet we don't have an inclusion of $\underline{Hw}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ into $\underline{Ht}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ for a general S since π is not t-exact).

In most of loc. cit. and in [NeR04] H was the category of finitely generated projective modules over R; so $\underline{C}$ was equal to $D(R)$.

2. In this partial case in the papers mentioned (essentially) the t-exactness of our functor G was established (certainly, it yielded the right t-exactness of $G\pi$). In particular, it was verified (see Proposition 3.2 of [Dwy06]) that $\underline{C}(\mathcal{R}, G\pi(\mathcal{R})) \cong \underline{C}(\mathcal{R}, H_0^t(G\pi(\mathcal{R})))$ (see the notation of §2.2) is isomorphic to $R[S^{-1}]$. Certainly, this statement also follows from our calculation of $\underline{Hw}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ (since $R[S^{-1}] \cong \mathrm{End}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}\,\mathcal{R}$).

The usage of t-structures explains why 'big' triangulated categories were needed in [Dwy06] and [NeR04]; cf. Remark 4.3.4(4) of [Bon10a]. Note in contrast that the weight-exactness of π holds for its restriction to a 'much smaller' $\underline{C}'$ (such a category was very important for the K-theory computations of [NeR04]). Besides, the 'duality' between weight and t-structures allows us to study the properties of π (that is not left t-exact in general).

3. Certainly, any object of H yields the obvious exact functor $\mathrm{AddFun}(H^{op}, Ab) \to Ab$. Set-theoretic difficulties prevent us from saying that H^{op} embeds into the category of exact functors from $\underline{Ht}$ to Ab (and the same is true for $H[S^{-1}]_{add}^{op}$ and $\underline{Ht}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$). Yet one can still choose a (large enough) small abelian (exact)

subcategory $\underline{A} \subset \underline{Ht}$ such that H^{op} embeds into the category of exact functors $\underline{A} \to Ab$. So, we obtain certain 'Yoneda-like' descriptions of H and $H[S^{-1}]_{add}$. Note also that the restriction of π to H can be described via the restriction of the exact functors $\underline{A} \to Ab$ mentioned to the subcategory $\underline{A} \cap G(\underline{Ht_{\mathcal{E}}})$.

One can also avoid set-theoretic difficulties by finding some 'small substitute' for $\underline{C}$; cf. Definition 4.7 of [NeR04].

4. For $\underline{C}$ possessing a differential graded enhancement (see Definition 6.1.2(3) of [Bon10a]; this includes all possible triangulated categories whose objects are complexes) and any w the weak weight complex functor (see Proposition 3.1.3(9)) can be lifted to an exact functor $t^{st} : \underline{C} \to K(\underline{Hw})$ (see §6.3 of [Bon10a] in the case when w is bounded). So, the localization homomorphism $R \to R[S^{-1}]$ is *stably* flat (see Theorem 0.7 of [NeR04] and Proposition 3.3 of [Dwy06]) whenever $t^{st}_{\underline{E}}$ is fully faithful.

5. One can also prove the existence of $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ and the weight-exactness of π more directly via an 'unbounded' generalization of Proposition 1.1.3.

4 On birational motives and weights for them

We prove that our results yield an 'elementary' proof of the existence of certain weight structures for various triangulated categories of birational motives (defined via the method of [KaS02]).

4.1 The definition of birational motives

Now we define certain categories of birational motives over a base U. We generalize the method described in [KaS02] to a somewhat more general context.

For a scheme U one considers a certain additive category $Cor(U)$. Two possible versions of $Cor(U)$ were described in §10.4 of [CiD09] (there U was assumed to be excellent finite-dimensional separated). We do not need a precise definition of $Cor(U)$ in this paper (so, we will not specify which version of it we consider); in particular, one can choose arbitrary (commutative unitial) 'coefficient rings' when defining $Cor(U)$. We will only require $Cor(U)$ to satisfy the following properties: its objects are certain U-schemes (with the disjoint union operation corresponding to the direct sum in $Cor(U)$); for any X/U such that $X \in \operatorname{Obj} Cor(U)$ and any smooth finite type $f : Y \to X$ we have: $Y \in \operatorname{Obj} Cor(U)$ and $f \in Cor(U)(Y, X)$ (we will make no distinction in notation between schemes and their morphisms and the corresponding objects and morphisms in various 'motivic' categories that we consider in this section).

Next (see §11.1.9 of ibid.) one considers $K^b(Cor(U))$ and localizes it by the triangulated subcategory generated by two types of complexes: the complex $\mathbb{A}^1 \times X \to X$ for any $X \in \operatorname{Obj} Cor(U)$ (we will denote the set of these complexes by B_{HI}) and by complexes of the form $W \overset{g-k}{\to} Y \bigoplus V \overset{j+f}{\to} X$ (we will denote the set of these complexes by B_{MV}) for any elementary (Nisnevich) distinguished square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
W \arrow[r, "k"] \arrow[d, "g"] & Y \arrow[d, "f"] \\
V \arrow[r, "j"] & X
\end{tikzcd}$$

of objects of $Cor(U)$ (this is a certain Cartesian square; j, k are open dense embeddings). One defines $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ as the Karoubization of the triangulated category obtained.

Now (following Definition 5.1 of [KaS02]) we define $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ as the Karoubization of the localization $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ by the subcategory generated by (images in $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ of) complexes of the form $U \overset{j}{\to} X$ for all open dense embeddings j of objects of $Cor(U)$. We will denote the set of these complexes by B_{bir}.

4.2 A weight structure for $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$

We make the following simple observation: by definition, $B_{MV} \subset \langle B_{bir} \rangle$. Hence $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ is (isomorphic to) the Karoubization of the localization of $K^b(Cor(U))$ by $\langle B_{bir} \cup B_{HI} \rangle$. Hence we can apply all the results of the previous sections to this setting! We denote the heart of the corresponding weight structure w_{bir} for $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ by $Chow^o(U)$. So, it consists of retracts of $\{X : X \in \operatorname{Obj} Cor(U)\}$ in $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$, and is isomorphic to the Karoubization of $Cor(U)[(S_{bir} \cup S_{HI})^{-1}]_{add}$ for the corresponding S_{bir}, S_{HI} (see Theorem 1.2.2). Hence it is also isomorphic to the Karoubization of $Cor(U)[S'^{-1}]$ where S' is the closure of $S_{bir} \cup S_{HI} \cup \operatorname{id}(\operatorname{Obj} Cor(U))$ with respect to the direct sum operation (see Remark 1.2.4(1)).

Now we describe a certain method for computing $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ and $Chow^o(U)$. The authors are not sure that all the steps of it work for arbitrary U and 'arbitrary $Cor(U)$'; possibly we will fill in the details later.

First we localize $K^b(Cor(U))$ by $\langle B_{HI} \rangle$. Note here that all elements of S_{HI} are coretractions (cf. Remark 3.2.2(4)); so one can apply the calculations from §8.2 of [Bon09]. Moreover, one can probably express $D_{HI} = K^b(Cor(U))/\langle B_{HI} \rangle$ in terms of certain (cubical) Suslin complexes; cf. §5 of ibid. In particular, the morphisms between objects of $Cor(U)$ in D_{HI} could be expressed as the morphisms in $Cor(U)$ modulo certain 'homotopy equivalence' relation.

Next one should localize D_{HI} by B_{bir} (and consider the Karoubization of the category obtained). Note here: in order to compute $Chow^o(U)$ it suffices to consider the localization of the $K^b(\underline{Hw}_{HI})$ by B_{bir} (here we apply Remark 3.2.2(2)).

Also note that (in the notation of Remark 1.1.4(2)) the category $S_{bir,X}$ for any $X \in \operatorname{Obj} Cor(U) \subset \operatorname{Obj} D_{HI}$ is filtering. Moreover, for 'any reasonable $Cor(U)$' one can verify the 'first left Ore condition' (i.e. that one can convert morphism of the type $s'^{-1}f'$ into fs^{-1}). For $X, Y \in \operatorname{Obj} Cor(U)$ it follows that $\varprojlim_{t_U \in S_Y}(\varinjlim_{t_Z \in S_X} \underline{Hw}_{HI}(Z, U))$ surjects onto $Chow^o(U)(X, Y)$ (and these surjections respect compositions).

One can also try to apply Remark 3.3.4(3) to calculations in $Chow^o(U)$. Note here: Theorem 3.3.3(1,4,5) yields the natural generalization of Proposition 7.4 of [KaS02] in our setting (the corresponding $\underline{Ht_{\mathcal{E}}}$ was denoted by $HI^0(-)$ in [KaS02]).

Now we briefly recall some consequences of the existence of a bounded weight structure for $DM^o_{gm}(U)$.

Remark 4.2.1. 1. There exists an exact conservative *weight complex* functor $DM^o_{gm}(U) \to K^b(Chow^o(U))$; cf. §3.1 of [Bon10c].

2. We define $K_0(Chow^o(U))$ as the Abelian group with one generator $[X]$ for each $X \in \operatorname{Obj} Chow^o(U)$, and one relation $[Y] = [X] + [Z]$ for any $X, Y, Z \in \operatorname{Obj} Chow^o(U)$ such that $Y \cong X \bigoplus Z$. For $K_0(DM^o_{gm}(U))$ we take similar generators and set $[Y] = [X] + [Z]$ if $X \to Y \to Z \to X[1]$ is a distinguished triangle.

Then the embedding $Chow^o(U) \to DM^o_{gm}(U)$ yields an isomorphism $K_0(Chow^o(U)) \cong K_0(DM^o_{gm}(U))$; see Theorem 5.3.1 of [Bon10a].

3. For any (co)homological functor $H : DM^o_{gm}(U) \to \underline{A}$ ($\underline{A}$ is an abelian category) there exists certain *Chow-weight* spectral sequences $T(H, X)$ that relate the cohomology of any $X \in \operatorname{Obj} DM^o_{gm}(U)$ with that of the terms of its weight complex. $T(H, X)$ is $DM^o_{gm}(U)$-functorial in X starting from E_2. $T(H, X)$ induces a certain (Chow)-weight filtration on $H_*(X)$ (or $H^*(X)$); this filtration is also $DM^o_{gm}(U)$-functorial and can be (easily) described in terms of weight decompositions (only); see §2 of ibid.

We also make certain remarks on the relevance of our results.

Remark 4.2.2. 1. So, we obtain some new tools for 'computing $Chow^o(U)$' (for a general U). Moreover, the authors hope that Remark 1.1.4(1) will be relevant for computing $DM^o_{gm}(U)$-morphism groups between $DM^o_{gm}(U)_{w_{bir}=0}$ and $DM^o_{gm}(U)_{w_{bir}=n}$ for (certain) $n < 0$.

Another relevant observation here: for any additive A, $S \subset \operatorname{Mor}(A)$, $\underline{C} = K^b(A)$, $B = \operatorname{Cone}(S) \subset K^b(A)^{[-1,0]}$, one can easily describe $B_{[n,0]} \subset B_{[n-1,0]}$ (cf. Proposition 1.1.3(2,3)) by a natural generalization of (2).

2. It is certainly 'more interesting' to consider weight decompositions of those objects of $DM^o_{gm}(U)$ that do not belong to $DM^o_{gm}(U)_{w=i}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ (then one can obtain non-trivial weight filtrations and weight spectral sequences for (co)homology). Certainly, we would also like these objects to 'come from U-schemes'. So, it seems natural to look for some birational motives of non-smooth finite type U-schemes and for (birational) motives with compact support of (certain) finite type U-schemes. If one can define certain motives of this type for U-schemes in $DM^{eff}_{gm}(U)$, then one can also obtain the corresponding birational motives by applying the localization functor. Unfortunately, it seems that for a general U the theory of [CiD09] yields 'reasonable' motives (with compact support) for arbitrary finite type U-schemes only in the category $DM_c(U)$ (this is the 'stabilization' of $DM^{eff}_{gm}(U)$ with respect to Tate twists; it's better to consider motives with rational coefficients here). Yet this is no problem if U is the spectrum of a perfect field. Besides, in the general case one can still define certain motives (with compact support) of U-schemes in $DM^{eff}(U)$ (this is a 'cocompletion' of $DM^{eff}_{gm}(U)$; one also obtains the certain 'non-constructible' birational motives this way) using the results of ibid.

3. Since an $X \in \operatorname{Obj} Cor(U)$ in $DM^o_{gm}(U)$ becomes isomorphic to any open dense $X' \subset X$, the objects of $Chow^o(U)$ are retracts of the 'birational motives of generic points of $Cor(U)$'. Moreover, we suspect (following [Kah12]) that $DM^o_{gm}(U)$ splits as the direct sum of the corresponding categories over (generic) Zariski points of U. Yet this could depend on the version of $Cor(U)$ chosen. In any case, even the existence of w_{bir} was not clear previously for U being the spectrum of an imperfect field.

4. In the case when U is the spectrum of a perfect field (and for the 'classical' i.e. Voevodsky's $Cor(U)$; see [Voe00]) the existence of w_{bir} was already known previously. One can distinguish three ('old') methods of the proof. Their (common) main disadvantage is that they rely on certain (quite hard) results of Voevodsky; they also require certain additional restrictions on U.

(i) By Proposition 3.1.3(7,8) it suffices to verify that the objects of $Cor(U)$ (i.e. smooth U-varieties) form a negative subcategory of $DM^o_{gm}(U)$. This was done in §7 of [KaS02] in the case $\operatorname{char} U = 0$.

(ii) Another method is to prove the existence of some weight structure w_{eff} for $DM^{eff}_{gm}(U)$ or for some its 'completion' that yields a weight structure for $DM^o_{gm}(U)$. Note here: in this case the subcategory $\langle B_{bir}\rangle_{DM^{eff}_{gm}(U)}$ is exactly the Tate twist $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)(1)$ of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ (resp. of its 'completion'); it is isomorphic to $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ by the Voevodsky's cancellation theorem. Hence by Theorem 3.2.1(1) (or by its partial case given by Proposition 8.1.1(1) of [Bon10a]) w_{eff} yields a weight structure for $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ if there exists an $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that the functor $-(1)[i]$ (i.e. the composition of the Tate twist with $[i]$) is weight-exact with respect to w_{eff} (see Definition 3.1.1(VI)).

Surprisingly, there are two 'geometric' possibilities here and an infinite set of certain 'less explicit' ones; they are ('mostly') parametrized by i.

(iia) In the case $i = 2$ there is the *Chow weight structure*; its heart is the category of effective Chow motives (which is a full subcategory of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$; see [Voe00]). This was our reason for denoting $\underline{Hw}_{bir}$ by $Chow^{o}(U)$.

In the case $\operatorname{char} U = 0$ one can take any coefficient ring here (see Proposition 6.5.3 of [Bon10a]); in the case $\operatorname{char} U = p > 0$ one has to invert p (and apply the main result of [Bon11]).

(iib) For $i = 1$ and a countable field U one can construct a certain Gersten weight structure. Its heart is 'generated' by certain (co)motives of function fields over U (see Proposition 4.1.1 of [Bon10b] for more detail); so it is only defined for a certain 'completion' $\mathfrak{D}(U)$ of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$.

(iic) One can also construct a '$-(1)[i]$-stable' weight structure on a certain version of $\mathfrak{D}(U)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$; see §4.9 of [Bon10b]. Even more generally, one can 'glue' certain weight structure from w_{bir} by considering certain 'shifts' of it (by arbitrary integral numbers) on the categories $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)(j)/DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)(j+1) \cong DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ for j running through all $\mathbb{N}$. Yet the author does not know of any constructions of weight structures of this sort that would not rely on the existence of the 'explicit' weight structures (that were already mentioned above).

5. It is no wonder that the computations in $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ are related with Suslin complexes (somehow; due to the relation between $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ and D_{HI} mentioned above). These complexes are very important for the theory of Voevodsky's motives (at least, over a perfect field; cf. also [Lev09]); in particular, in [Bon09] a certain 'differential graded description' of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ for U being the spectrum of a characteristic 0 field was given. The disadvantage of Suslin complexes is that their cohomology is usually very hard to compute (for instance, a better understanding of these cohomology would yield the celebrated Beilinson-Soule vanishing conjecture). The authors hope to find a way of calculating morphism groups in $DM_{gm}^{o}(U)$ that would not rely on the computation of cohomology for Suslin complexes; this would also improve our understanding of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$.

References

[BBD82] Beilinson A., Bernstein J., Deligne P., Faisceaux pervers// Asterisque 100, 1982, 5–171.

[Bon09] Bondarko M.V., Differential graded motives: weight complex, weight filtrations and spectral sequences for realizations; Voevodsky vs. Hanamura// J. of the Inst. of Math. of Jussieu, v.8, 2009, no. 1, 39–97, see also `http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AG/0601713`

[Bon10a] Bondarko M., Weight structures vs. t-structures; weight filtrations, spectral sequences, and complexes (for motives and in general)// J. of K-theory, v. 6, i. 03, p. 387–504, 2010, see also `http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.4003`

[Bon10b] Bondarko M., Motivically functorial coniveau spectral sequences; direct summands of cohomology of function fields// Doc. Math., extra volume: Andrei Suslin's Sixtieth Birthday (2010), 33–117.

[Bon10c] Bondarko M.V., Weights for Voevodsky's motives over a base; relation with mixed complexes of sheaves, preprint, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1007.4543`

[Bon11] Bondarko M.V., $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$-motivic resolution of singularities// Compositio Mathematica, vol. 147, is. 5, 2011, 1434–1446.

[Bon12] Bondarko M.V., Weight structures and 'weights' on the hearts of t-structures// Homology, Homotopy and Applications, vol. 14, 2012, No. 1, 239–261.

[Coh85] Cohn P.M., Free rings and their relations, second edition, Academic Press, London & New York, 1985. xxii + 588 pp.

[CiD09] Cisinski D.-C., Deglise F., Triangulated categories of mixed motives, preprint, `http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.2110`

[GaC67] Gabriel P., Zisman M., Calculus of fractions and homotopy theory. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 35. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1967.

[Cis10] Cisinski D.-C., the answer `http://mathoverflow.net/questions/44047/localizing-a`

[Dwy06] Noncommutative localization in homotopy theory, in: Noncommutative localization in algebra and topology, 24–39, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 330, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.

[Ger82] Gerasimov V.N., Localization in associative rings (Russian)// Siberian Math. Zh. 23–6 (1982), 36-54.

[Heb11] Hébert D., Structures de poids à la Bondarko sur les motifs de Beilinson// Compositio Mathematica, vol. 147, is. 5, 2011, 1447–1462.

[Kah12] Kahn B., personal communication, 2012–2013.

[KaS02] Kahn B., Sujatha R., Birational motives, I, preprint, `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/K-theory/0596/`

[KaS09] Kahn B., Sujatha R., Birational motives, I: pure birational motives, preprint, `http://arxiv.org/abs/0902.4902`

[Kra01] Krause H., On Neeman's Well Generated Triangulated Categories// Doc. Math. 6, 2001, 121–126.

[Lev09] Levine M. Smooth motives, in: R. de Jeu, J.D. Lewis (eds.), Motives and Algebraic Cycles. A Celebration in Honour of Spencer J. Bloch, Fields Institute Communications 56, American Math. Soc. (2009), 175–231.

[Mal82] Malcolmson P., Construction of universal matrix localizations, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 951, (1982), 117–132.

[Nee01] Neeman A. Triangulated Categories. Annals of Mathematics Studies 148 (2001), Princeton University Press, viii+449 pp.

[NeR04] Neeman A., Ranicki A., Noncommutative localisation in algebraic K-theory I// Geometry & Topology, vol. 8, 2004, 1385–1425.

[Pos11] Positselski L., Mixed Artin-Tate motives with finite coefficients// Mosc. Math. J., vol. 11, is. 2, 2011, 317–402.

[Sch85] Schofield A. H., Representation of rings over skew fields. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 92. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985. xii+223 pp.

[Voe00] Voevodsky V. Triangulated category of motives, in: Voevodsky V., Suslin A., and Friedlander E., Cycles, transfers and motivic homology theories, Annals of Mathematical studies, vol. 143, Princeton University Press, 2000, 188–238.

[Wil09] Wildeshaus J., Chow motives without projectivity// Compositio Mathematica, v. 145(5), 2009, 1196–1226.